

FILED

08 APR 11 AM 9:21

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY: *M*

DEPUTY

MICHAEL FOX

PLAINTIFF

VERSES

CASE NUMBER
07 CV 2388 DMS (POR)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al

DEFENDANTS

PLAINTIFFS DEFENSE TO DEFENDANTS
MOTION ON MOTION TO DISMISS.

PLAINTIFF MICHAEL T FOX COMES ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND STATES TO THIS HONORABLE COURT THE FOLLOWING AS TO DEFENDANT ASKING FOR AN EX PARTA ORDER TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS CASE.

1) PLAINTIFF RECEIVED NOTICE OF EX PARTA MOTION DATE---AND DEFENDANTS MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS ACTION ON TUESDAY APRIL 8TH 2008.

2A) PLAINTIFF HAVING SERVING THE ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS ON ALL THREE LIST DEFENDANTS BY A LICENSED COURT PROCESS SERVER
ON DEC 28 2008 ON THE FBI OFFICE ON AREO DRIVE IN SAN DIEGO CA.== US ATTORNEYS OFFICE AT 880 FRONT ST. SAN DEIGO CA..

PLAINTIFF SERVING ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND PETITION ON THE US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AT 950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE WASHINGTON DC ON JAN 4TH 2008 BY A LICENSED PROCESS SERVER.

DEFENDANTS CLAIM THERE IS NO PROOF OF SERVICE, DEFENDANTS ALL RECEIVED A SUMMONS WITH THERE COMPLAINT THAT WAS SERVED ON THEM.. DEFENDANTS STATING CONTINUING NONSENSE..

2B) PLAINTIFF MAILING COPY'S OF ANSWER TO JUDGE SABRAWS ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS THERE MOTION--COPY OF APPLICATION TO THE COURT FOR DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS--COPY OF NOTICE OF MOTION

FOR DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS---AND NOTICE OF PROOF OF SERVICE WHERE MAILED TO ALL THREE DEFENDANTS ON APRIL 1ST 2008 BY CERTIFIED MAIL (FBI)--9797 AREO RD SAN DIEGO CA --CERTIFIED MAIL# 7005 0390 0005 8232 4994--DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE--950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE WASHINTON DC CERTIFIED MAIL# 7005 0390 0005 5007--UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE 880 FRONT ST SAN DEIGO CA MAILED CERTIFIED MAIL# 7004 1350 0005 6967 2063

2C) BOTH US ATTORNEYS OFFICE AND FBI IN SAN DIEGO CA RECEIVING THIS PAPER WORK ON APRIL 2 2008
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RECEIVING PAPER WORK ON APRIL 7TH 2008

3) US ATTORNEYS OFFICE FILING THERE MOTION AND THERE MOTIONS COMPLAINT WITH ARGUMENTS, AND ECT. AND FURTHER THERE LEGAL QUEST TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF COMPLAINT AND PETITION AND ITS EXHIBITS APRIL 7TH 2008 ELECTRONICLY..

4) PLAINTIFF ASKS THE COURT--WHY DID THE DEFENDANTS NOT FILE THE MOST RECENT PENDING ACTION SEEKING DISMISSAL OF THE PLAINTIFFS CASE, BUT CHOSE TO ASK THE COURT FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME ON FEB 26 2008 -TO ANSWER PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS.. DEFENDANTS STATING IN THERE EXPARTA ORDER SEEKING ADDTITIONAL TIME, DEFENDANTS NEED ADDITIONAL TIME FOR THE REASON OF THE COMPLEXITY OF THIS CASE AND HOW LARGE BY NUMBER OF PAGES THROUGH ITS EXHIBITS OF THE PLAINTIFFS COMPLAINT, THAT THE DEFENDANTS NEED MORE TIME TO ANSWER, TO DO A GOOD AND THOURAL JOB. (DEFENDANTS ARE GING TO ANSWER COMPLAINT)

5) THAT THE DEFENDANTS DID NOT SEEK DISMISAL OF PLAINTIFFS CASE UNTIL AFTER MICHAEL FOX THE PLAINTIFF HAD SENT CERTIFIED MAIL. A COPY OF MOTION HEARING FOR DEFAUULLT JUDGEMENT-- AND APPLICATION OF DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS AS TO THE PLAINTIFFS PETITITON AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS PLAINTIFF FURTHER SENDING AN ANSWER OF JUDGE SABRAW'S ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS THERE EXPARTA ORDER, ANSWERING QUESTIONS THE COURT WAS ASKING OF THE PLAINTIFF, REGARDING 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT...

6) DEFENDANTS HAVE STILL NOT ANSWERED THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND ITS PETITION, ONLY TO COME TO THE COURT TO SEEK THE COURTS POWER TO SAVE THE DEFENDANTS FROM THERE GROSS MISS HANDLING OF THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS, BY SLANDER AND INTIMADATION AND UTTERLY OUT RIGHT LIES. DEFENDANTS TRYING TO CON THE COURT, WITH CASE LAW THAT HAS UTTERLY HAS NO

REFECTION ON THE PLAINTIFF, OR THE PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS..

7) AS THE PLAINTIFF HAS ALWAYS STATED--THERE WILL BE NO JUSTICE UNTIL A UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE ORDERS AN INVESTIGATION OF THE YEARS OF CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS UNDER DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF THE LAW.. THE PLAINTIFF HAS LIVED THROUGH RELENTLESS UNWARRANTED ABUSE, CAUSING SEVERE PAIN AND SUFFERING THE PLAINTIFF HAS SUFFERED THROUGH OVER 20 YEARS OF THE PLAINTIFFS LIFE.

8) THAT MICHAEL FOX HAS SINCE THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS HAS ASKED THE COURT FOR A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY. THE PLAINTIFF HAS SINCE OCT 22 2004 BEEN LIVING IN A VAN AND HAS BEEN UTTERLY DESTROYED PHYSICAL AND MONETARY BY ALL STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES THROUGH OUT THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. WHICH IS WHAT THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS ARE ALL ABOUT.

8A) PLAINTIFF FURTHER CONTINUES TO SEEK A COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEYS. PLAINTIFF NEEDS LEGAL COUNSEL. PLAINTIFF IS NOT AN ATTORNEY--AND PLAINTIFF KNOWS NOTHING OF LEGAL RULES AND PRODEURES AND FURTHER LOCAL RULES.PLAINITFF DOES NOT NO ANY CASE LAW. PLAINTIFF HAS DONE THE BEST HE CAN FIGHTING THESE GOVERNMENT STATE AND FEDERAL ENTITIES..AND OTHERS.

9) DEFENDANTS STATE THAT PLAINTIFF HAS FAILED TO PLEAD WITH SUFFICIENT SPECIFICITY, BASED UPON PLAINTIFFS CASE UPON INSUBSTANTIAL ALLEGATIONS, AND HAS FAILED TO EXHAUST HIS ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES. THIS STATEMENT IS LEGAL WORDS OF MINIPUTATION...PART OF PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH ITS EXHIBITS ARE TO HAVE COURT ORDER ISSUED AGAINST THE 3 DEFENDANTS TO INVESTIGATE AND CHARGE THESE VIOLATORS OF THE PLAINTIFFS CIVIL RIGHTS AS LISTED THROUGH OUT THIS COMPLAINT AND IT'S EXHIBITS..

9A) DEFENDANTS ARE USING THERE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAW WITH LAWYER TALK--TO FUTHER INTIMADE AND SLANDER THE PLAINTIFF WITH THERE UTTER NONSENSE... BECAUSE THE DEFENDANTS ARE GROSSLY IN DEFAULT, FURTHER CONTINUE TO NOT ANSWER THE COMPLAINT. DEFENDANTS 60 DAYS ARE UP ON THE 1ST. AMENDED COMPLAINT. IF GRANTED DEFENDANTS HAD UNTIL APRIL 7 2008 TO ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT, BUT DEFENDANTS CHOSE TO FILE FOR DISMISAL OF PLAINTIFF CASE.
(PLAINTIFFS CASE HAS HUGE MERRIT)

9B) DEFENDANTS ARE RESORTING TO CHARACTOR ASSINATION, SLANDER, INTIMADATION, AND LIES.. THE DEFENDANTS ARE WHO IS GROSSLY AT FAULT HERE, THERE ACTIONS OF DECIECT AND DENIAL. HAVE COME TO RUN A CON JOB ON THE COURT. DEFENDANTS GROSSLY DENYING TO ANSWER THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS.. STILL AS OF APRIL 11 2008. DEFENDANTS EVEN STATED THAT THE LAW IS THAT THE DEFENDANTS HAVE UNTIL APRIL 7 2008 SINCE THE FILING OF THE 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT WAS SERVED ON THEM, TO FILE AN ANSWER FOR THE ENTIRE COMPLAINT OF ISSUES. THAT DEFENDANTS HAVE UNTIL APRIL 7TH 2008 TO FILE AN ANSWER. AND STILL HAVE FURTHER DENIED TO ANSWER THE COMPLAINT, DEFENDANTS ARE MAKING UP BOGIS ALLEGATIONS THROUGH THERE CASE LAW, AS A RESULT OF THERE INCOMPETENCE THERE INSUFFICIENTY AND THERE NEGLECT, TO PROPERLY HANDLE THIS CASE. DEFENDANTS NOW RESULTING TO CRIMINAL WAR TACTICS TO COVER THERE MISTAKES, AND RUN A CON JOB ON THE COURT, ASKING THE COURT FOR A DIMISSAL OF THE PLAINTIFFS PROCEEDINGS..

10) PLAINTIFF ASKS THIS COURT TO SEE WHAT IS HAPPENING HERE, BY AND THROUGH THE DEFENDANTS ACTIONS, AND UTTERLY DENY THE DEFENDANTS MOTION SEEKING DIMISSAL OF PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS.. BECAUSE THE DEFENDANTS HAVE UTTERLY NO RIGHT TO A DISMISSAL..

11) PLAINTIFF FURTHER STATING THIS IS A HUGE CIVIL RIGHTS CASE, WITH HUGE AMOUNTS OF CREDABLITY AND MERRIT.. THE US ATTORNEYS OFFICE DOES NOT WANT TO DEAL WITH IT, OR HAVE OTHER VIOLATIONS FROM OTHER STATES AND THERE JURISDICTIONS TO BE HEARD IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, AS PLAINTIFF HAS REQUESTED IN THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT, AT HAND..

12) PLAINTIFF FURTHER STATES HE FILED AND ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH EXHIBITS, ON DEC 20TH 2008.. THIS CASE IS WHERE PLAINTIFF IS SEEKING COURT ORDERS OF THE COURT FOR CERTAIN STATED REASONS IN BOTH PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND THROUGH ITS EXHIBITS.

12A)PLAINTIFF FILED A 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT ON JAN 30 2008 REGARDING A STAGED CAR WRECK IN GALVISTON TEXAS.. THAT THE ORIGINAL 3 DEFENDANTS THE PLAINTIFF SERVED WAS THE FBI—US ATTORNEYS OFFICE--US JUSTICE DEPARTMENT. 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT DOES NOT LIST THESE FEDERAL ENTITIES AS DEFENDANTS IN THIS AMENDED COMPLAINT.

12B)PLAINTIFF IN THE ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS IS SEEKING COURT ORDERS TO FORCE THESE THREE ORIGINAL GOVERMENT ENTITIES TO INVESTIGATE THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT

AND AND ITS EXHIBITS, WHICH INCLUDED THIS STAGED CAR WRECK FROM GALVISTON TEXAS, WHICH IS PART OF EXHIBIT 1 & 2 OF THE ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT ..PLAINTIFF SETTING A MOTION DATE FOR THE PETITION ON MARCH 21 2008---PLAINTIFF SEEKING COURT ORDERS OF THE COURT AS TO THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT HE FILED..

13) PLAINTIFF IS SEEKING INFORMATION REGARDING THE ISSUES AT HAND IN THE PETITION & COMPLAINT.. AND ITS EXHIBITS.. AT THIS MOTION HEARING OF THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT.

13A) PLAINTIFF MOTION SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 21 2008 WAS TERMINATED BY THE COURT.

14) DEFENDANTS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO ANY EXPARTA DISMISSAL ORDER AS THEY ARE SEVERLY IN DEFAULT. DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO BE IN DEFAULT AS STATED IN THERE MOTION TO DISMISS, THAT DEFENDANTS ARE ENTITLED TO A DATE OF APRIL 7 2008 TO ANSWER BOTH ORIGINAL PETITION AND COMPLAINT, AND THE 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT..DEFENDANTS ARE NOT LISTED AS DEFENDANTS IN 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT..

15)DEFENDANTS ARE IN DEFAULT GROSSLY. DEFENDANTS DO NOT WANT TO ANSWER FOR THE REASONS THAT THAT HAVE FOUND THAT WHAT THE PLAINTIFF HAS DICTATED IN THE PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND THROUGH ITS EXHIBITS ARE TRUE TO THE FACT, AND DO NOT WANT TO FACE THE TRUTH IN COURT. DEFENDANTS ARE RUNNING FROM THE TRUTH AND ATTACKING THE PLAINTIFF WITH CASE LAW, THAT THE PLAINTIFF IS PARINOD, DELUSIONAL, AND NOT IN THE SCOPE OF REALITY.. (A GOVERNMENT LIE)

16) DEFENDANTS HAVE GROSSLY MISHANDLED THIS CASE, AND HAVE CONTINUED TO REFUSE TO NOT ANSWER THIS CASE. DEFENDANTS NOW RUN TO THE COURT WITH CASE LAW ASKING TO COURT TO SAVE THEM ON CASE LAW THAT HAS NO BEARING ON PLAINTIFFS CASE. PLAINTIFF ASKS THE COURT TO DENY DEFENDANTS MOTION AS IT IS BASE ON LIES AND DECEPTION, AND CASE LAW THAT HAS UTTERLY NO BEARING AS TO THE EVIDENCE AND ITS TRUTH IN THE PLAINTIFFS CASE.

DEFENDANTS CASE FOR DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFFS CASE HAS UTTERLY NO MERRIT..

17) PLAINTIFF FURTHER STATES THERE IS A DIVISION OF THE (FBI) THAT INVESTIGATES CRIMINAL CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS. PLAINTIFF UTTERLY DEMANDS AN INVESTIGATION AS TO THE FACTS OF THE PLAINTIFFS CASE.

18) DEFENDANTS SEEK A DISMISAL OF PLAINTIFFS CASE AS DUE TO A DECLARATION CLAIM THAT WAS TO BE FILED WITH THE FBI, BEFORE ANY CIVIL COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST THE FBI AGENTS.

PLAINTIFF ONLY LISTED INCIDENTS WITH FBI AGENTS, PETITION DOES NOT ASK FOR DAMAGES AS FROM THESE INCIDENTS WITH THESE FBI AGENTS, THAT THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT FILED WAS TO SEEK COURT ORDERS TO FORCE THE FBI-US ATTORNEYS OFFICE--AND US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO INVESTIGATE, AND CHARGE EACH PERSON AT FAULT IN THIS HUGE CRIMINAL CIVIL RIGHTS CASE UNDER DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF THE LAW..PLAINTIFF SEEKING NO DAMAGES AS TO THE ENCOUNTERS WITH THESE FBI AGENTS

19) PLAINTIFF SEEKING OTHER COURT ORDERS UN-RELATED TO THE FBI--JUST SEEKING A COURT ORDER TO FORCE THE FBI TO INVESTIGATE THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBITS...

WHERE-AS---PLAINTIFF SEEKS A COURT ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF CASE WITH PREJUDICE.

PLAINTIFF FURTHTER ASKS DEFENDANTS MOTION BE DENIED WITH PEDJUDICE

DATE OF

April 11 2008

PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER

MICHAEL FOX



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL FOX CASE NO.

PLAINTIFF 07 CV 2388 DMS (POR)

VERSES **ANSWER TO DECLARATION OF
AYANA K. WASHINGTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA et.al

Federal Bureau Of Investigations

DEFENDANTS

NOW COMES MICHAEL FOX THE PLAINTIFF AND STATES TO THIS COURT IN ANSWER TO A
DECLARATION OF AYANA K WASHINGTON OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS

- 1) THAT MICHAEL FOX WAS UNAWARE OF ANY LAW AS TO FILE A DECLARATION CLAIM AGAINST ANY FBI AGENT PRIOR TO FILING COMPLAINT IN COURT
- 1A) PLAINTIFF STATES THE FBI AGENTS NAMES THAT ARE LISTED ARE FOR REFERENCE OF A SITUATION WHERE PLAINTIFF HAD GIVEN A PARTIAL COMPLAINT TO A FBI AGENT, AND NEVER HEARING A WORD ABOUT IT..
- 2) PLAINTIFF KNOWING NOTHING IS GOING TO BE DONE OF THE SITUATION-FILED A PETITION AND COMPLAINT IN FEDERAL COURT CLERKS OFFICE IN SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA ON DEC 20 2007
- 3) IN THIS PETITION PLAINTIFF IS SEEKING COURT ORDER OF THE COURT TO ENFORCE THE FBI-US ATTORNEY OFFICE AND US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO INVESTIGATE THE COMPLAINT.
- 4) PLAINTIFF CONTINUES TO KNOW THAT ONLY IF A COURT ORDER IS ISSUED, WILL THERE EVER BE ANY KIND OF JUSTICE FOR THE PLAINTIFF..
- 5) FURTHER THE FBI AGENTS NAMES LIST ARE NOT BEING SUED AS A RESULT OF THE ISSUES THE PLAINTIFF HAVE BROUGHT FORTH.
- 6) PLAINTIFF KNOWING THERE ARE TOO MANY EVIL PEOPLE THAT RULE THE PLAINTIFFS LIFE, WHO HAVE FOR THE EXCESS OF 20 YEARS.. THERE WILL BE NO INVESTIGATION INTO THE GROSS AND HORRIFIC CIVIL RIGHTS

VIOLATIONS UNDER DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF THE LAW...

7) SINCE PLAINTIFF HAS ONLY USED AS REFERENCE FBI AGENTS NAMES AS OF INCIDENTS THAT HAPPENED, AND OTHER INSTANCES REGARDING FBI.. PLAINTIFFS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND EXHIBIT ARE ASKING FOR COURT ORDERS TO FORCE FBI-US ATTORNEYS OFFICE-US JUSTICE DEPT TO INVESTIGATE AND PROSEUTE THE PEOPLE AT FAULT..

8) AS OF NAMING FBI AGENTS NAMES AND NOT SEEKING DAMAGES IN REFERENCE TO THERE ACTIONS. PLAINTIFF ONLY USING NAMES AS REFERENCES TO INCIDENTS.. IT WOULD BE THE BELIEF THAT THIS ADMINISTRATION CLAIMS PROCEDURE HAS NO MERRIT IN THIS PENDING PETITION AND COMPLAINT CASE, SEEKING COURT ORDERS OF A JUDGE TO FORCE AN INVESTIGATION BY THE FBI PLAINTIFF SEEKING MANY OTHER COURT ORDER THAT HAS UTTERLY NO REFERENCE TO THE FBI IN THE PETITION AND COMPLAINT..

8A) THERE ARE A TOTAL OF 3 LISTED DEFENDANTS IN THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT-NOT ONLY THE FBI IF THIS HAS ANY BEARING ON THSI DELIEMA THAT IS AT HAND...

9) FURTHER PLAINTIFF IS ENTILED TO SOME DEGREE OF LATITUDE AS IN PRO PER REPRESENTATION..

PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER

MICHAEL FOX



April 11 2008